

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 93 00:15:20 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #267  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 28 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    267

Today's Topics:

    1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs  
        ARRL and it's members (2 msgs)  
        ARRL opposes temporary permits  
    Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code ) (2 msgs)  
        Real CBers (3 msgs)  
        Written CW (2 msgs)  
    Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 17:46:15 GMT  
From: concert!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!  
orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul26.173806.4528@ssc.com> markz@ssc.com (Mark Zenier) writes:

>Rev. Michael P. Deignan (kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com) wrote:

>: Clearly not. Therefore, I've come to the conclusion that the 3A and 3B  
>: elements ought to be recombined, and the question pool re-written to  
>: shore up the theory. Then, modify the license requirements so that  
>: Techs, regardless of code level, should pass Element 3.

>

>3B? I'd sure like to see the version of the question pool for that test  
>in the whatever wierd dimension you live in. HF band limits, Antennas,  
>propagation. The reason it's not combined is that the material tested

>is irrelevant for VHF.

Sheesh, Mark, what kind of crap is this? You are threatening to bring rational thought and factual information into an otherwise clueless flame war. What do you think you are doing?

>You don't have a clue what you're talking about, or you're  
>just making stuff up to piss people off.

It may not be an either/or dichotomy. Mike may be both clueless \*and\* making stuff up to piss people off. It would be consistent with his historical behavior.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 14:24:26 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:

>In article <1844@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>>OTOH, we should be called to task for not taking the time to list  
>>all of our benefits and services.

>This is certainly true.

>I've directed prospective new Amateurs to email Luck Hurder asking for  
>the New Hams packet which is supposed to include local testing session  
>information, etc... It was never received.

>The same fellow persevered and obtained his license, then sent mail again  
>requesting the Public Service Manual, again, it never arrived.

>:(

>I'm sure y'all are busy, but if you offer something, you should follow  
>through. Of course, this fellow may never actually have sent the request,  
>and lied to me, it's hard to tell.

Well, we process lots and lots of membership requests and I know some of them do indeed get lost. This is a bad thing, indeed, and one we are actively seeking to correct by an ongoing process of evaluating the quality and effectiveness of our existing services. We also have a committee looking at and recommending new membership services and changes to the ones we have.

>-BUT- I wonder, to what extent does participation on the net conflict with  
>the SIGNIFICANT revenue from publishing??? If a standard set of services  
>were well organized and consistently offered by the ARRL on the Inet,  
>would this cause a problem?

Well, our net participation does take away from some of our work, but a good part of our jobs is membership (and potential membership) contact, so I don't see a problem. The financial aspects of our net participation come about when I put the for-sale DXCC list, copies of QST articles, the ARRL Letter and the like out for free distribution. And I do. We also get occasional requests to put the Repeater Directory on line, and I am sure there are some who would like to see the entire ARRL Handbook made available that way, too. :-). Unfortunately, we just can't give it all away. The membership services must be paid for somehow; right now it is by a combination of dues, book sale and advertising revenue. Our participation on this forum is paid for by those, too.

I think we \*do\* offer a reasonable set of Internet services, with our presence and availability and our email server. The latter has been growing, and will continue to grow. Interestingly, a fair number of the users of these ARRL services are NOT ARRL members. This is okay; one of the reasons that we do this is so that potential members can sample the goodies before they buy the cake. We reach a lot of people interested in ham radio, via sci.electronics, rec.radio.cb, etc.

When we are better connected (separate flame-fest), we will be able to increase our level of participation, especially for the automated services. I do NOT foresee any significant increase in our participation in rec.radio.amateur news; I like to see an even balance there and truly hope that ARRL staffers don't overwhelm the newsgroups with sheer volume. I have been quite active of late, but, when the thread turns to the ARRL I think that I have every right to jump right in. :-).

>Email addresses should be noted in QST as well.

I will pass the suggestion along (again). Thanks.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

-----

Ed Hare, KA1CV  
American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111  
(203) 666-1541 - voice  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"You will never put the puzzle together  
if you keep putting all of the pieces  
back in the box." Colleen

-----

-----

Date: 27 Jul 93 13:47:36 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <25407B1w165w@nraven.wariat.org> floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

>system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>> That's not necessarily true. If you're a licensed amateur radio  
>> operator then the ARRL is helping to set policies that will ultimately

> ^^^^^^^

>> affect you.

>

> I guess if you take a loose interpretation you could call it

>that... again though, it's just the kind of help I don't need! :)

Sorta puts a new spin on an old joke...

"I'm from the Government^H^H^H^H^H^H^H^H^HARRL, and I'm here to help you!"

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp  |
|   WA9PDM     |      Use whichever one works  |
+-----+
```

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 19:49:38 GMT  
From: concert!gatech!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!linus!linus.mitre.org!mitre.org!  
eubanks@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1850@arrl.org> jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

> In rec.radio.amateur.policy, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:  
> >In article <1801@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:  
> >>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com  
> >(Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:  
>  
> [previous discussion of policy-by-poll deleted]

Puhleezz ! Let us stick to the subject!!!!  
^^^^^^^^

Fred started off with a re-trans of the bulletin that said ...ARRL  
(directors) voted to not endorse a temporary permits (actually did the  
bulletin say temporary, I thought the bulletin indicated permanent  
licenses?).

That's the issue!  
^^^^

Every post since that initial one (including Fred's responses) has been  
bickering about whether we vote on every issue or whether we like our form  
of representative government.

Somebody (John?, Al?) please get this thread back on the subject and tell  
us masses -

- 1) What did the directors specifically do? (temporary permits/permanent  
licenses)
- 2) How close the vote? Was the vote because of computer  
security/interoperability issues (plenty apply)?
- 3) What plans does the League have for reducing the exam-to-transmit delay?
- 4) If the directors believe there is no grass roots interest in this  
pressing issue, please register this electronic vote in disagreement.

Right now, there are thousands of neo-licensees who meet the postman every  
day. Let's see if the League can't help relieve their stress before  
somebody else comes up with a solution.

Vern, AA7EI (Ft Huachuca, AZ)  
(copies of entire thread to: Fried Heyn, WA6WZO, SW Dir; Cliff Hauser,  
KD6XH, AZ SM)

These are my personal opinions only.

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 17:52:42 GMT  
From: olivea!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!news-  
feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!  
prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@

Subject: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5c.716.28.0N178922@ppplace.com> pat.wilson@ppplace.com (Pat Wilson) writes:

>->

>-> And I'm sick of people telling me I \_must\_ learn code.

>->

>-> What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?

>-> What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?

>-> Not much.

>

>

>No one is telling you that you \_must\_ learn code. But you damned well  
>better learn it if you want to work other bands.

Hmmm... "damned well better learn it" ?

>It has nothing to do with building anything. It is a test designed to  
>make you study and learn. Nothing else. So, either learn it and pass  
>or complain and wait for the rules to change for you. Either way, good  
>luck on the codeless tech and welcome to 2 meters. (grin)

The amateur tests aren't there just to make people study and learn. They are there to encourage people to develop knowledge and skills valuable to the amateur radio service, and, in turn, to American commercial and military radio services. The question that should be answered is "Is the skill promoted by the CW test as important to radio today as it was 40 years ago?". At some point, you may discover that there are a number of skills, other than CW, as important to radio today as CW was 40 years ago. You may then understand why the CW test is looking increasingly dated.

>Let me know when you pass and I will see if I can work you long  
>distance. Course, you don't even have to pass a test to use the  
>telephone, too bad.

He could probably work you on 6m long-distance :-).

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 10:56:26

From: olivea!korie!west.West.Sun.COM!male.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!  
appserv.Eng.Sun.COM!appserv!rfm@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5c.716.28.0N178922@pplace.com> pat.wilson@pplace.com (Pat Wilson) writes:

No one is telling you that you must learn code. But you damned well better learn it if you want to work other bands. Let me know when you pass and I will see if I can work you long distance.

It is possible to work from VA to Purdue without using HF, y'know.

Rich

— —

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 18:07:15 GMT

From: elroy.jp1.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!concert!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!  
csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
lando.la.locus.com!dana@ames.arpa  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <232er5\$e8g@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU> cthomas@athena.mit.edu (Michael T Ford) writes:

>In article <CAs02z.F7H@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

&gt;&gt;

>>-... -.- -... - - - - -... -... -... -... -...

&gt;&gt;

 $\succ$ 

> - . - . - - - - . - - - . - . - . - - - - . - - - - . - - - - . - - - - . - - - - . - - - - . - - - - .

$$y = -\frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$$

Goodness, all this inefficient CW when it is easier to type what probably ought to be a personal message anyway:

CONGRATS ON THE UPGRADE NE (sic) WZOC

— —

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ                    | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136                    | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 18:02:31 GMT  
From: concert!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!  
orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami  
Kumaresan) writes:

>>>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

>  
>>> I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40  
>>> channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got  
>>>

>>> Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)

>  
>>Learned to talk in Morris? Negatory, Good Buddy. That's Morse,  
>>like horse. Ten-Four?

>  
>> --Robert

>  
>  
>Yeah, and thats GENUINE, now u try it, G-E-N-U-I-N-E

>  
>God! What an .. -.. .. --- - !

The brilliant words of Swami, using 15 characters to send what normally  
fits in 5. That's really the efficiency of CW, huh?

Oh, yeah, and he's flaming someone else for being an IDIOT.

>-.. . -.- -... .----- .- -- -... -...- .- .-

This sez:  
DE KB1AMB/AA

and happens to require 43 characters where simple ASCII requires only 12.

Why don't you save the empty flames for alt.radio.amateur.flame, if  
your site carries it?

--  
\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*



\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 12:50:29 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <L9aa8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

:rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

:  
:> I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40  
:> channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got  
:>  
:> Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)  
:  
:Learned to talk in Morris? Negatory, Good Buddy. That's Morse,  
:like horse. Ten-Four?

Naw, he's not talking about dots and dashes. He means the mode where you get on a repeater and call "Meeeeooooooooow Meow Meeeeooooooooow Meow Meeeeooooooooow Meeeeooooooooow Meow Meeeeooooooooow".

--

+-----+  
| Cliff Sharp | clifto@indep1.chi.il.us OR clifto@indep1.uucp |  
| WA9PDM | Use whichever one works |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 15:07:22 PDT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!nic.csu.net!vms4.sc.csupomona.edu!  
armyman@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Written CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people  
> have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by  
> ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum  
> it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one  
> sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.  
>

YES! I drives me up the wall!

I first learned CW about 15 years ago the visual way and then by sound. WRONG! Don't ever learn code this way! VERY hard to do, I kept converting the sound to the visual and then to character, TOO LONG. That's hard to do and I hardly even passed 5 WPM. How many of you have done this?? Lot's I bet.

Then 2 years ago I took up CW again, and since forgot the pictures (mostly), practiced the sounds and imeadiatly shot up 13 WPM and got my General.

Since then I've passed written elements 4A and 4B and I'm pushing myself to 20 WPM to pass code element 1C. It's a quest! I haven't use CW once on the air yet by I'm convinced to get my Extra.

So every time I see written CW it gives me the shudders and I look away.  
Glad I'm not the only one!  
Let's see more come out of the closet.

---

Alex R. Myrman KC6TMB - E-mail: armyrman@csupomona.edu  
College of Science Computational Systems - Phone: (909) 869-4226  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA. USA

Recovering visual CW user. On the wagon for 2 years.

-----

Date: 27 Jul 93 18:57:17 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Written CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Regarding the comments on written vs aural CW, I think I 'see' the letters as dots and dashes and translate them this way, even when copying at 30+ wpm. But in common with most of the other posters, I have to hum or otherwise enunciate written CW in order to read it at a decent speed, so I conclude that I really am 'hearing' the letters even if I (think I) see them as well.

I think it's best not to worry about how you copy CW - it's like going to sleep; if you think too hard about it, you can't do it.

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)  
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,  
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)  
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 20:51:07 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:  
>In article <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)  
>writes:

>> ( . and - CW deleted )

>> Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.

>> ...

>

>Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people  
>have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by  
>ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum  
>it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one  
>sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

>

>No profound conclusions, just a remark on something I find interesting.

>

>73... Mark AA7TA

>

One comment about "Now You're Talking!" I've seen occasionally  
is to include the code in this format. We think it's a mistake  
to learn it visually, as you don't copy it this way. (As a  
rule; I guess some folks copy .\_ and translate it later, but  
that's not how it's supposed to work.) If people must spell  
it out in Morris, I would prefer they use "dit," "dah," and  
"didah...." Dahdahdah dahdidah?

KR1S

--

jkearman@arrl.org

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 13:33:47 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CArxt0.71x@egr.uri.edu>, <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>,  
<CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>  
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )

In article <CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu> blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum) writes:

>What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?

>What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?

>Not much.

What does:

- \*knowing Part 97
- \*knowing Ohm's law
- \*knowing about RTTY
- \*knowing about AMTOR
- \*knowing about packet
- \*knowing about proper operating procedures
- \*knowing about EME
- \*etc.

have to do with building a satellite rig?

What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?

Not much.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM    |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

Date: 27 Jul 1993 15:59:28 -0700

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!

sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!

ornews.intel.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul26.210916.13205@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,

<231orc\$s7m@ornews.intel.com>, <3477@tekgen.bv.tek.com>s.kei.c

Subject : Re: Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!

An article appeared in Today's Oregonian newspaper about the public hearing on the proposed Washington County Antenna Ordinance to be held tonight, Tuesday, at 6:30pm in the Public Services Building, 155 N. First Ave., Hillsboro, Oregon.

The article describes complaints of conflict of interest about the amateur radio operator who is also a planner working on an ordinance affecting heights and numbers of towers. One resident has written a letter asking the director of the Dept. of Land Use and Transportation to table the ordinance and call in the county counsel to investigate the planner's actions. The article names the complaining resident as well as others. The department's principle planner

denied the acusations of bias and remarked that the amateur radio licensed planner's understanding of communications was helpful in developing ordinances regulating commercial as well as amateur devices. The planner said he has amateur equipment but no time to put up antennas.

- end paraphrasing, begin proselytizing-

It should be a good fight tonight. I wish I was going. From what I gather, most of the amateurs in the area are happy to accept the watered-down version of the ordinance which allows up to 60' towers without permit. Especially in contrast to the original proposal which required permits and fees for even a horizontal wire, let alone the thousands it would cost to erect any kind of tower. This seems like a Mutt-and-Jeff tactic to me.

There are some amateurs who are not going to accept any ordinances and are threatening lawyers and PRB-1 actions. And there are some very few (3?) but very noisy anti-antenna residents who don't like the watering-down of the ordinance and are also threatening as well as accusing.

--

WA7LDV zardo@ornews.intel.com

-----

Date: 27 Jul 93 11:09:45 GMT  
From: dds1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23JUL199307025189@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,  
<CAq72H.4r0@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, <29847@ksr.com>  
Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

In article <29847@ksr.com> jfw@ksr.com (Richard Milhouse Nixon) writes:  
>However, the FCC is not entirely backward; they \_have\_ issued preliminary  
>regulations to allow electronic filing, contingent (largely) on a federally-  
>approved standard for digital signatures and other authentication. That is  
>\_not\_ a simple problem, and it is one that the people out there in the cold,  
>cruel, real world take seriously.

The non-simple problem is getting the Gov't to approve a standard, NOT finding a good standard for digital signature verification. Look at sci.crypt to see mentions of several very secure methods.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM    |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #267

\*\*\*\*\*